

### **Remarks**

The Applicant has amended the specification to place it into final form for allowance. Entry into the official file is respectfully requested. Claims 19-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite. The Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's helpful comments with respect to specific ones of the claims. Claims 19, 34 and 36 have been amended to address the issues raised in the rejection. The rejection with respect to Claim 28 is now moot in view of its cancellation. Also, the issues with respect to Claims 25-27 and 34 have been resolved with respect to changes made to Claim 19. Claim 19 has also been amended to address the issue raised with respect to that claim. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

As noted above, Claim 19 has been amended. It has further been amended to include substantially the subject matter of Claims 20, 24 and 28. Those claims have accordingly been cancelled. Entry into the official file is respectfully requested.

Claims 19-35 stand rejected over four separate references, namely Chan, Collins, McCamy and Hofland. The Applicant respectfully submits that each of those publications fails to explicitly or implicitly disclose all of the subject matter of the claims to which those publications are applied. Reasons are set forth below.

With respect to Chan, Claims 19-23, 29-31, 33 and 35 have been rejected. In view of the amendment to Claim 19 incorporating the subject matter of Claim 28 (among others), the Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is now moot.

Claims 19-21, 23, 30, 31 and 33 are rejected over Collins. The Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is also moot in view of the incorporation of the subject matter of Claim 28 into Claim 19.

With respect to McCamy, the Applicant respectfully submits that McCamy fails to explicitly or implicitly disclose an elastically deformable stop comprising at least one foot having a convex shape directed toward the cylindrical cavity. Instead, McCamy discloses something quite different. To the extent that the McCamy structure is in any way applicable to the Applicant's claimed subject matter, the foot of McCamy is concave, not convex. Thus, McCamy is inapplicable. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Hofland also does not anticipate the solicited claims because it, too, fails to disclose an elastically deformable stop comprising at least one foot having a convex shape directed toward the cylindrical cavity. Instead, the Hofland structure, to the extent that it can be applied to the Applicant's claimed subject matter is different. In that regard, the Applicant notes the Examiner's helpful direction to the structure characterized as a deformable stop and listed in conjunction with reference numbers 44, 45 and 50. However, to the extent that those are elastically deformable stops, they are not of the claimed convex shape directed toward the cylindrical cavity. If they are indeed directed toward the cylindrical cavity, they are not of a convex shape. Those are flat shapes and not convex (or concave as in the case of McCamy). Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that the flat surfaces having a straight edge are not convex shaped and not applicable to the Applicant's rejected claims. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 36 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over the combination of Hoogland with each of Chan, Collins, McCamy or Hofland. The Applicant respectfully submits that such a hypothetical combination does nothing to cure the deficiency set forth above with respect to those publications. In other words, the hypothetical combination would result in a structure different from what the Applicant claims. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Applicant acknowledges the requirement for the election of species. The Applicant elects species V directed to Figs. 7-10. This election is made without traverse. The Applicant believes that all of the pending claims read on that species. In the event that the Examiner is of the opinion that selected ones of the claims do not read on that species, the Applicant requests the opportunity to discuss the matter at the Examiner's convenience.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that the entire application is now in condition for allowance which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury  
Reg. No. 31,750  
Attorney for Applicant

TDC/sh  
(215) 656-3381